

# **EXHIBIT E**



"Howard Vickery"  
<hvickery@bsfllp.com>  
09/15/2007 10:35 AM

To <richard.rothman@weil.com>,  
<Vernon.Broderick@weil.com>  
cc "Amy Neuhardt" <aneuhardt@bsfllp.com>, "George  
Frampton" <GFrampton@BSFLLP.com>  
bcc

Subject Re: CNO S.A. v. GE Co., et al 07 Civ. 8014 (CM)

Dear Rich,

I have no problem agreeing to an extension, but I will resist a deviation from the deliberate briefing schedule.. The situation in Brazil needs some time to resolve itself. Our client does not believe that the SDE had the authority to invalidate the exclusivity clause or that the opinion expressed in the underlying report is definitive. It is nothing more than a referral to CADE, the body with authority over anti-trust matters. My understanding is that GE is not free to disregard the exclusivity provision until CADE issues a definitive ruling.

Best regards,

Howard

----- Original Message -----

From: richard.rothman@weil.com <richard.rothman@weil.com>  
To: Howard Vickery  
Cc: Vernon.Broderick@weil.com <Vernon.Broderick@weil.com>  
Sent: Sat Sep 15 05:38:23 2007  
Subject: Re: CNO S.A. v. GE Co., et al 07 Civ. 8014 (CM)

Howard--we would like to avoid having our client incur further expense for our lawyers to work on the motion to dismiss over the weekend, when that may prove unnecessary, either because your client agrees to dismiss the case or because the Court directs that a formal motion is unnecessary at this point. Will you agree that, in the event your client does not agree to dismiss its case, you will agree to support our request for a brief extension of the briefing schedule for the motion to dismiss on Monday morning? Best regards, Rich

"Howard Vickery" <hvickery@bsfllp.com>

09/14/2007 08:08 PM

To  
<Vernon.Broderick@weil.com>, <richard.rothman@weil.com>  
cc

Subject  
Re: CNO S.A. v. GE Co., et al 07 Civ. 8014 (CM)

Dear Vernon,